



Islam in Britain Part III: The Wider Significance of the Situation

Christopher Barder¹

The trends already sketched have a serious bearing on the future for both the UK and for Israel. Yet another nation is subtly perhaps, to some degree overtly, for those who have eyes to see, succumbing to Islamic intimidation and therefore a *dhimmi* mentality. This is a bold appraisal and not one, which the politically correct majority will wish to label, other than alarmist and exaggerated. Nonetheless, telling evidence of broader and more significant trends often derives from what appear, in themselves, small clues.

In February 2009, Britain's first Muslim peer claimed that student societies were recruiting young British Jews to join the Israeli army. They fought, he said, in the recent Gaza conflict and should be prosecuted for war crimes on their return to Britain. Lord Ahmed of Rotherham said student unions had been "actively recruiting young people in Britain to join the Israeli Defence Force". British citizens had, he claimed, "gone out to fight against the Palestinian people". So much for innocent volunteering, but rather an exact equivalence to Muslim recruits really going to fight abroad for jihadist purposes, not humanitarian ones.

Lord Pearson invited the Dutch politician Geert Wilders, who is currently facing prosecution in the Netherlands for his outspoken analysis of the Islamist war on civilization, to screen his controversial film "Fitna" in the Lords on January 29, 2009, and discuss his views. This was, after all, in the wake of much adverse publicity – the Dutch Prime Minister described the film as having no purpose but provocation – and it behooved a member of the EU to find out for himself in a public forum in the Palace of Westminster, what the fuss was about. Lord Ahmed apparently issued a threat that he would personally mobilize 10,000 Muslims to prevent Wilders from entering the Upper House and would take the peer organising the event to court. In the face of such threats seemingly, following discussions between Muslim community figures and the Labour Chief Whip, the Home Secretary banned Wilders, who was blocked at the airport. This is not encouraging for parliamentary privilege, freedom of speech or standing up to intimidation. What ever happened to the natural justice of a fair hearing for both sides?

¹ **Christopher Barder** read history at Cambridge where he won a Foundation Scholarship. After research and postgraduate work, he became head of history and politics at a tutorial college in Oxford and went on to specialize in the Arab-Israel conflict and Middle East security issues. He has been interviewed on a number of radio shows, by an Italian news agency and appeared on TV. He has also tutored part time for Bath University and has written a number of articles, published in the UK, the US and Israel. **Mr. Barder** is a frequent contributor to Nativ.

CB is author of a number of ACPR publications including Policy Paper No. 101, "The EU and the Syrian Track: Israel Ensnared" (2000), a chapter in *Israel and a Palestinian State: Zero Sum Game?* (Zmora-Bitan Publishers and ACPR Publishers, 2001), of which he was Assistant Editor and also the books *Oslo's Gift of "Peace": The Destruction of Israel's Security* (ACPR Publishers, 2001) and *"Enough of Blood and Tears" Yitzhak Rabin A Statistically Based Survey of the Oslo Process, Its Agreements and Results* (ACPR Publishers, 2002).

In any case, Wilders was a democratically elected member of a European parliament.²

Nor was this all. Lord Ahmed described the decision to the Associated Press of Pakistan as a victory for the Muslim community.³ The problem is that Wilders and his film, however controversial, have to be judged fairly and the legislature has to have a chance to see them. What is it a precedent for, that they are banned and condemned out of hand?

The context for grasping the wider significance of the ban was the permission to enter and speak, on several occasions, including at London University's School of Oriental and African Studies, of Ibrahim Mousawi, foreign news editor of the Hizbullah TV station, al-Manar TV. He was particularly useful as he was speaking on Hizbullah, as an expert, described as "invited to participate in the program as he is a leading expert on Hizbullah" by an SOAS spokesman. The irony of this seems to have escaped both the authorities and the university. A terrorist participant (in media terms at least) is allowed to speak and indeed invited to, on the basis of his expertise. But he is neither viewed as divisive or inappropriate!

(Jewish) Board of Deputies chief executive Jon Benjamin said:

We are extremely concerned that Mousawi has been given permission to enter the UK, without any particular conditions being attached. We have taken this matter up with the Home Office. Hizbullah uses its media operations to promote terrorism and vicious hatred of Jews. Mousawi is exactly the kind of figure who should be excluded from the UK under the new regulations.⁴

The details suggest that since Margaret Thatcher's government defended Salman Rushdie against the Iranian *fatwa*, government has become more spineless, under Tony Blair and alarmingly more so under Gordon Brown. True, it can be argued demographic pressures have grown. But that is all the more reason to hold firm.

From Islamabad, let us zip a world away to London. Actually, it's nearer than you think. The flight routes between Pakistan and the United Kingdom are some of the busiest in the world. Can you get a direct flight from your local airport to, say, Bradford?

Where? Bradford, Yorkshire. There are four flights a week from Islamabad to Bradford, a town where 75% of Pakistani Britons are married to their first cousins. But don't worry, in the country as a whole, only 57% of Pakistani Britons are married to first cousins."⁵

Nor is this all. Population growth is working in favor of the Muslims, dramatically.

Between 1970 and 2000, the developed world declined from just under 30% of the global population to just over 20%, while the Muslim world increased from 15% to 20%. And in 2030, it won't even be possible to re-take that survey, because by that point half the "developed world" will itself be Muslim: In Bradford – as in London, Amsterdam, Brussels, and almost

² The present writer is echoing sentiments expressed by Melanie Phillips in an article in *The Spectator*, February 3, 2009, "The Intimidation of the House of Lords", at <<http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/3317931/the-intimidation-of-the-house-of-lords.shtml>>.

³ See <http://www.app.com.pk/en_/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=65842&Itemid=2>.

⁴ <<http://www.thejc.com/articles/outrage-hizbollah-man-allowed>>.

⁵ Mark Steyn, "From Islamabad to Bradford Degrees of Accommodation", NationalReviewOnline, February 21, 2009 at <<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NmVhYzRmOGYzYmQ3ODRhYjBiMzllYzc2NDNhZmZjMzU#more>>.

every other western European city from Malmo to Marseilles – the principal population growth comes from Islam.⁶

The picture that emerges from Whitehall circles is of a large degree of uncertainty about what is the right response to Islamism and this has engendered a depth of debate and division, which betrays the level of uncertainty and lack of reasoned sureness of touch at the center of the civil service, in the thinking and analysis of senior mandarins. Leaked documents in the hands of one senior committed journalist from within Whitehall suggest a protracted history and rash of government mistakes and of wrong appointments, leading to an enhancement of importance and prestige for the Muslim Brotherhood, through talks with and recognition of them and their followers.⁷ One example here must suffice for a much larger iceberg whose tip it represents

The Times (London) wrote on July 30, 2006:

DISTURBING details have emerged about the radical background of the chief adviser on Islamic affairs at the Foreign Office.

Mockbul Ali, a 26-year-old civil servant, was involved in a Muslim student group that has published material supporting Palestinian female suicide bombers.

The Union of Muslim Students (UMS), which has been repeatedly praised by ministers as a paragon of moderate Islam, also carried articles in its newspaper by Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, a Qatar-based preacher banned from entering America.

Leaked documents show that since joining the Foreign Office Ali has argued for Qaradawi to be allowed into Britain and played a part in sending Sharif Hasan al-Banna, president of the UMS, to Islamic conferences in Indonesia and Nigeria at taxpayers' expense.

MPs have voiced concern about Ali's role at the heart of government. They accuse him of using his position as a senior member of the Foreign Office's Engaging with the Islamic World Group (EIWG) to promote dialogue with Islamist groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood, which is outlawed in many Arab countries...

Since the EIWG's creation about three years ago, its budget has grown from £1.5m to £8.5m and it has a staff of 26. Despite opposition from some Home Office advisers, Ali has argued in favour of granting entry visas to two radical Muslim clerics...

Last night, Michael Gove, the Tory frontbencher and author of the book **Celsius 7/7**, which addresses Islamist extremism, called for a review of Ali's role. "His influence in the Foreign Office gives rise to serious questions," he said.⁸

That is an understated response. At the heart of government lies a whole nest of advice and policy making which bodes ill for voices for a free speech and an open market place of ideas and for a preservation of values opposed to Islamist tyranny, since compromise and the choice of wrong interlocutors has already done so much damage. Infiltration is a serious business in a democracy, which has a fear of racism and religiously related prejudice and aspires to freedom and fair play. Also, in a democracy, vote-catching is a more or less legitimate pastime.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ See the remarkable document at <<http://www.policyexchange.org.uk/images/libimages/176.pdf>>.

⁸ <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article694631.ece>>.

Tactically, says Dr. Patrick Sookhdeo, the government is being outmaneuvered and hindered by ignorance. What follows is taken from an interview of him, before *shari`ah* became as established as it is in 2009.⁹

Islamic clerics regard themselves as locked in mortal combat with secularism.

For example, one of the fundamental notions of a secular society is the moral importance of freedom, of individual choice. But in Islam, choice is not allowable: there cannot be free choice about whether to choose or reject any of the fundamental aspects of the religion, because they are all divinely ordained. God has laid down the law, and man must obey.

Islamic clerics do not believe in a society in which Islam is one religion among others in a society ruled by basically non-religious laws. They believe it must be the dominant religion – and it is their aim to achieve this.

That is why they do not believe in integration. In 1980, the Islamic Council of Europe laid out their strategy for the future – and the fundamental rule was never dilute your presence. That is to say, do not integrate.

Rather, concentrate Muslim presence in a particular area until you are a majority in that area, so that the institutions of the local community come to reflect Islamic structures. The education system will be Islamic, the shops will serve only *Halal* food, there will be no advertisements showing naked or semi-naked women, and so on.

That plan, says Dr Sookhdeo, is being followed in Britain. That is why you are seeing areas which are now almost totally Muslim. The next step will be pushing the Government to recognize *shari`ah* law for Muslim communities – which will be backed up by the claim that it is “racist” or “Islamophobic” or “violating the rights of Muslims” to deny them *shari`ah* law.

There is already a *Shari`ah* Law Council for the UK. The Government has already started making concessions: it has changed the law so that there are *shari`ah*-compliant mortgages and *shari`ah* pensions.

Some Muslims are now pressing to be allowed four wives: they say it is part of their religion. They claim that not being allowed four wives is a denial of their religious liberty. There are Muslim men in Britain who marry and divorce three women, then marry a fourth time – and stay married, in *shari`ah* law, to all four.

The more fundamentalist clerics think that it is only a matter of time before they will persuade the Government to concede on the issue of *shari`ah* law. Given the Government’s record of capitulating, you can see why they believe that.”

Appeasement, trying to be accommodating, compromising, caving-in: These represent traits in response to Islamic encroachment. They are true in Britain and in the EU. But they have, since the Oslo Accords, been true in Israel (and indeed before 1993). There is a plan of stages for Britain, evidently. There is also one, of course, against Israel. The question remains: will the lessons be learned?

⁹ Alasdair Palmer, “England: The day is coming when British Muslims form a state within a state”, *Daily Telegraph*, February 19, 2006, to be found at <<http://www.hvk.org/articles/0706/159.html>>.